

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/520,404	MARTINEK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher A. Revak	2131	

All Participants:

(1) Christopher A. Revak.

(2) Michael Hull.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 April 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

lack of antecedent basis and claimed trademark name

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Call 4/5/05
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner found the applicant's current amendments to be allowable over the prior art of record, however, the examiner identified numerous antecedent basis problems and the use of a trademark name in the claims. The applicant's representative agreed to an examiner's amendment in an attempt to compact prosecution since the claims were allowable over the prior art of record..